

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/771,893	REITHINGER, JUERGEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dionne H. Pendleton	2627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dionne H. Pendleton. (3)_____.

(2) Steven Noll (Reg. 28,982). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 09 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-5,8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bohn US 6,584,301; Everett US 5,317,330.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that the "common core" of claim 1 should be understood to be of ferromagnetic material. Though arguable, the Applicant offers to amend claim 1 to more clearly define invention. Applicant argues that the "correction capacitor" of Everett does not perform the function as recited in the claim.

Applicant further argues that the various embodiments of Everett fail to teach an embodiment fairly combinable with the invention of Bohn since Everett teaches an embodiment having two antennas but no capacitor; or a single antenna with a capacitor.

The Examiner agrees to study further and urges Applicant to include detailed arguments in his response to the final rejection issued on 8/15/2007. .